

Mental Health Planning Council of Virginia
Adult Services Committee Meeting
Friday, July 8, 2005
Charlottesville Public Library

Committee Members present:

Jack Wood and Brian Parish, Co-Chairs, Mary Kay Johnson, Vicky Fisher, Dawn Gerard
Sharon Koehler, Pat Shank

Guest:

Gail Nardi

The meeting was called to order by Jack Wood at 10:30. Introductions were made. He asked if the full council had assigned any specific subjects for the meeting. The council's request was for feedback on the Block Grant Draft.

Notes:

- A. The committee welcomed Ginger Quillen as the new Administrative Assistant, (AA), to the council.
- B. Will Farris was recognized and congratulated on his new position in absentia.
 - 1. Questions:
 - i. Will this create any new changes for the Council?
 - ii. Will he be more involved?
 - iii. It is suspected that impact will be minimal.
 - 2. Janet has moved on to another position
- C. Jack explained that as Ray had a conflict of interest, he had signed the support letter to DMASS on behalf of the Department of Medical Assistance Services, Department of Rehabilitative Services, and other partners in the state's application to the Centers for Medicaid Services for a new Medicaid Infrastructure Grant, (MIG). Copy attached.
- D. It was suggested that the AA procure an acronym dictionary or glossary for council.
- E. The Office of Inspector General sent his proposed inspection agenda to all facility directors. Most of it was very good in Jack's opinion. Most of them have been done and posted on the OIG website, (Jack was proud of the fact that Catawba had no findings).

F. Committee members brought up the fact that they often needed business cards when doing business for the Planning Council.

G. Committee reports should be a part of every full council session.

Guest:

Gail Nardi of the Department of Social Services, (DSS), expressed her concern about the waiting list at local CSBs for discharge planning assessments, causing people to be placed in unsatisfactory housing options or not being placed at all. She would like the council to send a position statement to the Olmstead Commission, the State Human Rights Commission and the CSBs.

She has only been with the DSS for about 6 months but her people have brought this to her attention several times. She thinks that DSS regulations say the CSB has to do the assessment. Committee members suggested that DSS pay an outside provider to do the assessments if the CSB couldn't. She wasn't sure they could. She will check her regulations. Ms. Nardi felt that the CSBs were in violation of the ADA because of this problem. Council members suggested that DSS may be the one in Violation of the law. The discussion was tabled until Ms. Nardi has gathered more information.

It was suggested that the waiting list for the CSBs is not accurate because it could be those waiting to be served, those waiting to gain entry to the CSB or those who had given up and were not being served by anyone. Is it possible to access the data on this?

It was also addressed that DSS, although a mandated member of the council had had no representation as of this date. It was suggested that the council reach out to the DSS and Corrections and ask who is assigned or suggest that someone be chosen to represent them.

Block Grant Comments: (Brian Parish chaired this portion of the meeting.

A. Members feel that the money should be used for inventive, consumer run and recovery based programs instead of funding programs that are ongoing. It was commented that whenever someone requests funds for a new and innovative program, they are told there are no funds.

a. Recovery Based plans:

i. Focus on getting back a meaningful life.

ii. Self direction.

iii. Self determination.

B. Many would like to see the process moved back to competitive grants. It was suggested that the Department give notice that by the year 200? It would be a competitive grant system.

- C. System change is needed! Accountability and sustainability should be stressed and adhered to.
- D. There is no choice if services are not available in their CSB.
- E. Critical Gaps:
 - a. Lack of consumer run or peer directed are not available to all. This is not mentioned. Without services availability, there is no choice.
 - b. It is stated that more people were served with the same amount of funding. No evidence has been provided. How were they served and to what level?
 - c. Waiting lists figures unclear.
 - d. Laws should not be passed unless money is allocated to put them into practice.

The Real Choices Document was discussed and many committee members commented on the fact that this is a very impressive document. Copies will be sent to committee chairs. Comments and advice are encouraged.

Meeting Adjourned 2:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
L. Ginger Quillen, AA